

Message Text

SECRET

PAGE 01 VIENNA 09286 100620Z

55

ACTION ACDA-19

INFO OCT-01 EUR-25 ISO-00 CIAE-00 PM-07 H-03 INR-10 L-03

NSAE-00 NSC-10 PA-04 RSC-01 PRS-01 SPC-03 SS-20

USIA-15 IO-14 OIC-04 AEC-11 OMB-01 NEA-10 TRSE-00

SAJ-01 DRC-01 /164 W

----- 087316

P R 092113Z NOV 73

FM AMEMBASSY VIENNA

TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 511

SECDEF WASHDC PRIORITY

INFO USMISSION NATO BRUSSELS

AMEMBASSY BONN

AMEMBASSY LONDON

USNMR SHAPE

USCINCEUR

S E C R E T VIENNA 9286

MBFR NEGOTIATIONS

FROM US REP MBFR

E.O. 11652: GDS

TAGS: PARM, NATO

SUBJECT: MBFR NEGOTIATIONS: TEXT OF 8 NOVEMBER AD HOC GROUP

DRAFT ASSESSMENT OF SOVIET PROPOSAL

FOLLOWING TEXT PREPARED BY A DRAFTING SUB-GROUP OF

AD HOC GROUP IS TO BE PRESENTED BY FRG REP

(BEHREND) AT SCHEDULED NOVEMBER 9 REPORT TO NAC.

DRAFTING SUB-GROUP IS PREPARING A REVISED TEXT

BASED ON AD HOC GROUP DISCUSSION (REPORT SEPTTEL)

IN ORDER TO GIVE CAPITALS A COMMON ASSESSMENT OF

SOVIET PROPOSAL.

BEGIN TEXT:

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 02 VIENNA 09286 100620Z

WORKING GROUPS DRAFT

PRELIMINARY ANALYSIS OF WP REDUCTION PROPOSAL OF 8 NOVEMBER

I. MOTIVES

THE SOVIET PROPOSAL APPEARS TO BE INTENDED TO SERVE A VARIETY OF PURPOSES, AND THE PRECISE PRIORITIES AMONG THEM CANNOT, OF COURSE, BE STATED WITH CONFIDENCE AT THIS TIME:

A. THE EAST, WHICH SAW THE WEST HOLD THE INITIATIVE IN THE NEGOTIATIONS IN THE FIRST DAYS OF THE CONFERENCE, EVIDENTLY WANTED TO TRY TO GAIN THE INITIATIVE AND, MORE BROADLY, TO TRY TO GET THE WEST TO NEGOTIATE ON A BASIS OF SOVIET CONCEPTS. IN PARTICULAR THE SOVIETS APPARENTLY WANTED TO DEVELOP ARGUMENTS AGAINST CERTAIN MAJOR FEATURES OF THE WESTERN APPROACH WHILE AVOIDING A DIALOGUE ON AWKWARD ISSUES LIKE DISPARITIES. AT THE SAME TIME THE SOVIETS PROBABLY HOPED THAT THEIR PROPOSAL WOULD -SOONER OR LATER - HAVE AN IMPACT ON WESTERN PUBLIC AND PARLIAMENTARY OPINION.

II. POINTS OF DIFFERENCE BETWEEN NATO AND WP APPROACHES

1. THE WARSAW PACT MAINTAINS THE EXISTING FORCE RELATIONSHIP SHOULD NOT BE ALTERED AS A RESULT OF REDUCTIONS. CONSEQUENTLY THE WP APPROACH IGNORES DISPARITIES AND EMPHASIZES THE EQUIVALENCE OF REDUCTIONS. IN A FIRST SYMBOLIC STAGE THEY PROPOSE EQUAL QUANTITATIVE REDUCTIONS (20,000); THEY WOULD BE TWO SUBSEQUENT MORE SUBSTANTIVE STAGES OF EQUAL PERCENTAGE (5 PERCENT PLUS 10 PERCENT), APPLIED TO ALL FORCES OF EACH NATIONALITY.

2. THERE IS NO MENTION OF "ASSOCIATED MEASURES". IN HIS STATEMENT KHRUSHCHEV RESTRICTS THE "AGREED SUBJECT OF THE NEGOTIATIONS" TO THE MUTUAL REDUCTIONS OF FORCES AND ARMAMENTS.

3. THERE IS NO MENTION OF VERIFICATION IN THE DRAFT AGREEMENT. IN KHRUSHCHEV'S STATEMENT THERE IS ONE SENTENCE REFERRING TO VERIFICATION BY NATIONAL MEANS.

4. FOR THE INITIAL REDUCTION OF 20,000 MEN THE MIX IS NOT DEFINED, WHILE FOR THE SUBSEQUENT PERCENTAGE REDUCTIONS THE WP INSISTS ON THE CONCURRENT REDUCTION OF BOTH "NATIONAL AND FOREIGN FORCES".

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 03 VIENNA 09286 100620Z

5. THE WP PROPOSES THE INCLUSION OF NUCLEAR AND AIR FORCES IN ALL STAGES.

6. THE WP PROPOSES THAT FOREIGN FORCES OF BOTH SIDES SHOULD REMOVE ALL THEIR EQUIPMENT WHEN THEY WITHDRAW, AND THAT REDUCTIONS SHOULD BE BY THE SAME KIND OF UNITS ON EACH SIDE.

7. THE PROPOSED RESTRICTION ON THE INTRODUCTION OF NEW EQUIPMENT TO "ROUTINE REPLACEMENT" APPEARS INTENDED TO HAMPER NATO FORCE IMPROVEMENT.

8. THE EXPLICIT INCLUSION OF ARTICLE 8 (A PROHIBITION ON THE FUTURE ASSUMPTION OF CONFLICTING INTERNATIONAL OBLIGATIONS) COULD BE INTENDED TO INHIBIT FUTURE EUROPEAN DEFENCE ARRANGEMENTS.

III. POSITIVE FEATURES OF THE WP PROPOSAL

1. THE WP HAS OPENED A SERIOUS DIALOGUE.

2. EVEN AS AN OPENING BID, THEIR PROPOSAL IS LESS EXTREME THAN IT MIGHT HAVE BEEN (E.G. THE REDUCTIONS PROPOSED ARE SMALLER THAN IN EARLIER SOVIET PROPOSALS).

3. THE PROPOSAL PROVIDES FOR REDCUTION IN PHASES, THOUGH THESE ARE DIFFERENT FROM THE WESTERN CONCEPT.

4. THE PROPOSAL DOES NOT DISCRIMINATE AGAINST THE BUNDESWEHR.

5. IT ACCEPTS THE NGA AS THE REDUCTION AREA, BUT EXCLUDES HUNGARY.

6. NO DEMANDS ARE MADE ABOUT FRENCH PARTICIPATION; FRENCH FORCES IN GERMANY ARE, HOWEVER, ADDRESSED BYINFERENCE IN THE FIRST SENTENCE OF ARTICLE 6, WHICH WOULD OBLIGE THE FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY TO PREVENT ANY INCREASE OF FRENCH FORCES ON ITS TERRITORY. END TEXT.HUMES

SECRET

NNN

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: X
Capture Date: 01 JAN 1994
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: FOREIGN POLICY POSITION, NEGOTIATIONS, TROOP REDUCTIONS
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 09 NOV 1973
Decaption Date: 01 JAN 1960
Decaption Note:
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Authority: golinofr
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 28 MAY 2004
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1973VIENNA09286
Document Source: CORE
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: n/a
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: GS HUMES
Errors: N/A
Film Number: n/a
From: VIENNA
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1973/newtext/t19731142/aaaabfce.tel
Line Count: 145
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE
Office: ACTION ACDA
Original Classification: SECRET
Original Handling Restrictions: n/a
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 3
Previous Channel Indicators:
Previous Classification: SECRET
Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Reference: n/a
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Authority: golinofr
Review Comment: n/a
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 28 AUG 2001
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review History: RELEASED <28-Aug-2001 by smithrj>; APPROVED <30-Oct-2001 by golinofr>
Review Markings:

Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
30 JUN 2005

Review Media Identifier:
Review Referrals: n/a
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: MBFR NEGOTIATIONS: TEXT OF 8 NOVEMBER AD HOC GROUP DRAFT ASSESSMENT OF SOVIET PROPOSAL
TAGS: PARM, UR, NATO, MBFR
To: STATE
Type: TE
Markings: Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005